arXiv:1503.06402v1 [math.PR] 22 Mar 2015

Quasi-regular Dirichlet forms and the obstacle problem for elliptic equations with measure data

Tomasz Klimsiak
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Nicolaus Copernicus University
Chopina 12/18, 87–100 Toruń, Poland
e-mail: tomas@mat.uni.torun.pl

Abstract

We consider the obstacle problem with irregular barriers for semilinear elliptic equation involving measure data and operator corresponding to a general quasi-regular Dirichlet form. We prove existence and uniqueness of a solution as well as its representation as an envelope of a supersolution to some related partial differential equation. We also prove regularity results for the solution and the Lewy-Stampacchia inequality.

1 Introduction

Let E be a Lusin space, m be a σ-finite positive measure on $\mathcal{B}(E)$ and let $(L, D(L))$ be a Dirichlet operator associated with some quasi-regular possibly non-symmetric Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ on $L^2(E;m)$. In the present paper we investigate the obstacle problem of the form

$$\begin{cases} -Lu \le f(x,u) + \mu & \text{on } \{u > h_1\}, \\ -Lu \ge f(x,u) + \mu & \text{on } \{u < h_2\}, \\ h_1 \le u \le h_2 \quad m\text{-a.e.}, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where μ is a smooth measure with respect to the capacity determined by L, $f : E \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and h_1, h_2 are measurable functions on E such that $h_1 \le h_2$ m-a.e. We also consider one-sided problem, i.e. we allow $h_1 \equiv -\infty$ or $h_2 \equiv +\infty$.

The class of operators associated with quasi-regular Dirichlet forms is quite wide. It includes local operators in divergence form, nonlocal α-laplacian type operators, Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type operators in Hilbert spaces and others (see, e.g., [7, 8, 13, 14, 16] for concrete examples). We think that the fact that nonlocal operators fit into our general framework is of special interest, because problem (1.1) with nonlocal operator and measure data is considered here for the first time.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): Primary 35J91, 35J57; Secondary 60H30.

Key words or phrases: Obstacle problem, semilinear elliptic equation, Dirichlet operator, measure data, Dirichlet form.

The research was supported by Polish NCN grant no. 2012/07/D/ST1/02107.

In the paper we impose very weak conditions on the data μ, f, h_1, h_2. As for μ we assume that it belongs to the class

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\mu : |\mu| \text{ is smooth and } \hat{G}\phi \cdot \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b} \text{ for some } \phi \in L^1(E;m) \text{ such that } \phi > 0 \ m\text{-a.e.}\} \tag{1.2}$$

considered in [14]. Here $|\mu|$ denotes the variation of μ, $\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ is the space of all finite smooth signed measures on $\mathcal{B}(E)$ and $\hat{G}$ is the co-potential operator associated with $\mathcal{E}$. Of course the class $\mathcal{R}$ depends on the structure of $\mathcal{E}$. If $\mathcal{E}$ is transient then $\mathcal{M}_{0,b} \subset \mathcal{R}$. In general the inclusion is strict. For instance, if $d \geq 3$ and L is the α-Laplace operator with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ on a bounded smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ then $\mathcal{R}$ includes the space $L^1(\Omega; \delta^{\alpha/2}(x)\,dx)$, where δ is the distance to the boundary of Ω. Thus in that case $\mathcal{R}$ includes Radon measures of infinite total variation. Elliptic equations involving Laplace operator and $L^1(\Omega; \delta(x)\,dx)$ data were considered in [22]. Note that it also may happen that $\mathcal{R}$ includes nowhere Radon measures.

The function $f : E \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be continuous and nonincreasing with respect to the second variable. We also assume that $f(\cdot, 0) \cdot m \in \mathcal{R}$ and for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(\cdot, y)$ is quasi-integrable (see Section 2). These assumptions on f but with the latter replaced by stronger assumption saying that $\sup_{|y|\leq r} |f(\cdot, y)| \in L^1$ for every $r > 0$ were used previously in many papers devoted to linear and nonlinear equations involving measure data and local operators (see, e.g., [1, 4]). Semilinear elliptic equations with quasi-integrable data and local operators were considered in [18]. Equations with quasi-integrable data and nonlocal operators were considerd for the first time in [13] (see also [14]).

In the paper we do not impose any regularity assumption on the barriers h_1, h_2. Therefore to guarantee the existence of a solution we have to assume that they satisfy some kind of the separation condition. Roughly speaking, our condition says that between the barriers one can find some function being a difference of two natural potentials (see Section 3).

Since our data are irregular, the classical approach to (1.1) via variational inequalities (see [5, 25]) does not apply. In the present paper by a solution to (1.1) we understand a solution of the complementary system (see [10]). In the classical case of quasi-continuous barriers and L^2 data it is a pair (u, ν) consisting of a quasi-continuous function u on E and a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -Lu = f(x, u) + \mu + \nu, \\ h_1 \leq u \leq h_2 \quad m\text{-a.e.}, \\ \int_E (u - h_1)\,d\nu^+ = \int_E (h_2 - u)\,d\nu^- = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where ν^+, ν^- denote the positive and negative parts in the Jordan decomposition of ν. But in general, under the weak assumptions on f, μ described above, we cannot expect that the solution u of (1.1) belongs to the domain $D[\mathcal{E}]$. Therefore the problem to make sense of the first equation in (1.3) arises. Following [13, 14] we address it by using stochastic analysis methods. Namely, by a solution of the first equation in (1.3) we mean a function $u : E \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for quasi-every (q.e. for short) $x \in E$ the following generalized Feynman-Kac formula

$$u(x)=E_x\int_0^\zeta f(X_t,u(X_t))\,dt+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t. \tag{1.4}$$

Here $\mathbf{M}=(X,P_x)$ is a special standard process with life-time ζ associated with the form $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$, E_x is the expectation with respect to P_x and A^μ,A^ν are continuous additive functionals of $\mathbf{M}$ in the Revuz correspondence with μ and ν, respectively. It is worth remarking that from [14] it follows that if $\mu,\nu\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ and $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ is transient and satisfies the strong sector condition then (1.4) is equivalent to

$$\langle u,\delta\rangle=(f(\cdot,u),U\delta)_{L^2(E;m)}+\langle\mu,U\delta\rangle+\langle\nu,U\delta\rangle,\quad \delta\in S^{(0)}_{00}. \tag{1.5}$$

Here $S^{(0)}_{00}$ is the set of all finite energy integral Radon measures δ such that $\|U\delta\|_\infty<\infty$, where $U\delta$ is the (0-order) potential of δ (see [7]). Note that (1.5) is a generalization of the Stampacchia definition by duality introduced in [26] for solutions of uniformly elliptic PDEs with measure data.

Our main result on existence and uniqueness of solutions of the complementary system (1.3) is first proved for one reflecting barrier in Section 3 and then for two barriers in Section 4. It is worth mentioning that in both cases we give necessary and sufficient conditions on barriers h_1,h_2 under which there exists a solution u of (1.3) with f,μ satisfying our assumptions. We also prove that u is an envelope of a supersolution of some partial differential equation related to (1.3). More precisely, we show that

$$u=\text{quasi-essinf}\{v\ge h_1\ m\text{-a.e.},\ v\text{ is a supersolution of PDE}(f+d\mu-d\nu^-)\}, \tag{1.6}$$

where as before ν^- denotes the negative part of the reaction measure. To our knowledge this result is new even for L^2 data. A similar to (1.6) result was proved in [12] for evolution obstacle problem involving divergence form operator.

In case $\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$, $f(\cdot,0)\in L^1(E;m)$ and the barriers satisfy some additional regularity condition we show that $\nu\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$. This when combined with the regularity results proved in [13, 14] implies that for every $k\ge0$ the truncation $T_k(u)=(-k)\vee u\wedge k$ of u at the level k belongs to the extended Dirichlet space and

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u),T_k(u))\le 2k(\|\mu\|+\|\nu\|+\|f(\cdot,0)\|_{L^1(E;m)}),$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the total variation norm on the space of signed Borel measures on E.

Finally, in Section 5 we prove the Lewy-Stampacchia type inequality, which is known to be useful in the study of regularity of solutions of (1.3). If one of the barriers, say h_1, is a difference of two natural potentials then

$$\nu^+\le\mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(f(x,h_1)+\mu+Lh_1)^-.$$

Let us note that even in the case of local operators there are only few results of this type for two-sided obstacle problem (see [17]).

2 Preliminaries

In the whole paper E is a Lusin space and m is a positive σ-finite measure on $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

Let $D[\mathcal{E}]$ be a dense linear subspace of $L^2(E,m)$ and let $\mathcal{E}: D[\mathcal{E}]\times D[\mathcal{E}]\to\mathbb{R}$ be a bilinear form.

We say that $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ is positive if $\mathcal{E}(u,u)\ge 0$ for $u\in D[\mathcal{E}]$. A positive definite form $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ is called a coercive closed form if

(a) $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}},D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a symmetric closed form on $L^2(E;m)$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ denotes the symmetric part of $\mathcal{E}$, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(u,v)=\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}(u,v)+\mathcal{E}(v,u))$, $u,v\in D[\mathcal{E}]$,

(b) $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ satisfies the weak sector condition, i.e. there exists $K>0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{E}_1(u,v)|\le K\mathcal{E}_1^{1/2}(u,u)\mathcal{E}_1^{1/2}(v,v),\quad u,v\in D[\mathcal{E}].$$

Here and henceforth,

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha(u,v)=\mathcal{E}(u,v)+\alpha(u,v),\quad u,v\in D[\mathcal{E}]$$

for $\alpha>0$.

We say that $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a Dirichlet form if it is closed coercive form and for all $u\in D[\mathcal{E}]$, $u^+\wedge 1\in D[\mathcal{E}]$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(u+u^+\wedge 1,u-u^+\wedge 1)\ge 0,\quad \mathcal{E}(u-u^+\wedge 1,u+u^+\wedge 1)\ge 0.$$

It is known that for any Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ there exists a unique operator $(L,D(L))$ on $L^2(E;m)$ (sometimes called Dirichlet operator) such that

$$D(L)\subset D[\mathcal{E}],\quad \mathcal{E}(u,v)=(-Lu,v),\, u\in D(A), v\in D[\mathcal{E}].$$

By $\{G_\alpha\}_{\alpha>0}$ (resp. $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$) we will denote the strongly continuous contraction resolvent (resp. semigroup) generated by $(L,D(L))$.

Given $F\in\mathcal{B}(E)$ we set $D[\mathcal{E}]_{|F}=\{u\in D[\mathcal{E}]: u=0 \text{ on } F^c\ m\text{-a.e.}\}$. An increasing sequence $\{F_k\}$ of closed subsets of E is called $\mathcal{E}$-nest if $\bigcup_{k\ge1}D[\mathcal{E}]_{|F_k}$ is dense in $D[\mathcal{E}]$ with respect to the norm $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1^{1/2}$. A set N is an $\mathcal{E}$-exceptional set if $N^c\subset\bigcap_{k\ge1}F_k^c$ for some $\mathcal{E}$-nest $\{F_k\}$. We say that a property in E holds q.e. if it holds outside some exceptional set. For a given nest $\{F_k\}$ we set

$$C(\{F_k\})=\{f:E\to\mathbb{R}; f_{|F_k} \text{ is continuous for every}\, k\ge 1\}.$$

We say that a function u on E is $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous if there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $\{F_k\}$ such that $u\in C(\{F_k\})$.

A Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$ on $L^2(E;m)$ is called quasi-regular if

(a) there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $\{F_k\}$ consisting of compact sets,

(b) there exists an $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1^{1/2}$-dense subset of $D[\mathcal{E}]$ whose elements have $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous m-versions,

(c) there exist a sequence $\{u_n\}\subset D[\mathcal{E}]$ of $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous functions and an $\mathcal{E}$-exceptional set $N\subset E$ such that $\{u_n\}$ separates points of $E\setminus N$.

Let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ be a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E;m)$. It is known that there exists an m-tight special standard process $\mathbf{M} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}, \{P_x\}_{x\in E_\Delta}, \zeta, \theta)$ properly associated with the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$, i.e. for every $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E) \cap L^2(E;m)$,

$$T_t f(x) = E_x f(X_t)$$

for m-a.e. $x \in E$ and $x \mapsto E_x f(X_t)$ is $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous.

We say that a positive measure μ on $\mathcal{B}(E)$ is $\mathcal{E}$-smooth if $\mu(N) = 0$ for every $\mathcal{E}$-exceptional set $N \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ and there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $\{F_k\}$ of compact subsets of E such that $\mu(F_k) < \infty$, $k \geq 1$. The set of all $\mathcal{E}$-smooth measures will be denoted by S.

It is known that there is one-to-one correspondence between positive $\mathcal{E}$-smooth measures and positive additive functionals (PCAFs) of $\mathbf{M}$. This correspondence, called Revuz correspondence, can be expressed as

$$\lim_{t\searrow 0} E_m\big(\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t f(X_s)\,dA_s\big) = \int_E f\,d\mu, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}^+(E).$$

For $\mathcal{E}$-smooth measure μ we denote by A^μ the unique CAF of $\mathbf{M}$ associated with μ.

We say that a form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is transient if the associated semigroup $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ is transient, i.e. for every nonnegative $\phi \in L^1(E;m)$ the limit

$$G\phi \equiv \lim_{n\to\infty} G_{1/n}\phi$$

is finite m-a.e.

For a form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ we define $\mathcal{F}_e$ as follows: $\mathcal{F}_e$ is the family of all functions u on E for which there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-Cauchy sequence $\{u_n\} \subset D[\mathcal{E}]$ such that $u_n \to u$ m-a.e. ($\{u_n\}$ is called the approximating sequence for u). It is known that if $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is transient then for each fixed $u \in \mathcal{F}_e$ the limit of $\{\mathcal{E}(u_n, u_n)\}$ is independent of the approximating sequence for u. We set $\mathcal{E}(u,u) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{E}(u_n, u_n)$.

A nonnegative measurable function $u : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is called $\mathcal{E}$-excessive if $T_t u \leq u$ for $t \geq 0$ and $T_t u \uparrow u$ as $t \downarrow 0$. We say that u is an $\mathcal{E}$-natural potential if u is an $\mathcal{E}$-excessive function and for every increasing sequence $\{\tau_k\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ with limit τ such that $\tau \geq \zeta$,

$$E_x u(X_{\tau_k}) \to 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of all $\mathcal{F}$ stopping times.

We say that a function $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-integrable ($f \in qL^1(E;m)$ in notation) if $A^{|f|\cdot m}$ is a finite AF of $\mathbf{M}$. We say that a function $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is locally $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-integrable if $A^{|f|\cdot m}$ is an AF of $\mathbf{M}$.

In [18] the notion of quasi-integrability was considered in the case of Laplace operator. Let us mention that our notion of quasi-integrability is more general (since it applies to wider class of operators), but at the same time is stronger than the notion introduced in [18] in the particular case of Laplace operator. As a matter of fact the quasi-integrability introduced in [18] coincides with the local quasi-integrability considered in the paper [11] devoted to elliptic systems involving Laplace operator (see comments following [11, Remark 2.3]). Let us also note that in the case of Laplace operator the life-time ζ of the associated process is predictable. Therefore the results of [11] suggest that in the case of operators associated with a quasi-regular Dirichlet form for which the life-time of the associated process is predictable (e.g. regular Dirichlet form without killing part) the main results of our paper hold true if in their assumptions we replace quasi-integrability by local quasi-integrability.

In the rest of the paper if there will be no ambiguity we drop the letter $\mathcal{E}$ in the notation. For instance, instead of writing $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous, $\mathcal{E}$-smooth, etc. we simply write quasi-continuous, smooth, etc. By $\rightarrow_P$ we denote the convergence in probability P. $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$, $x^- = \max(-x, 0)$.

3 One-sided obstacle problem

In the rest of the paper we assume that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a transient quasi-regular Dirichlet form, $f : E \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $h, h_1, h_2 : E \to \mathbb{R}$ are measurable functions and μ is a measure on $\mathcal{B}(E)$ such that $|\mu| \in S$.

For $\mu \in S$ we set

$$R\mu(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t, \quad x \in E.$$

We will need the following hypotheses.

(H1) $(f(x, y) - f(x, y'))(y - y') \le 0$ for every $x \in E$ and $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}$.

(H2) $y \mapsto f(x, y)$ is continuous for every $x \in E$.

(H3) $x \mapsto |f(x, y)| \in qL^1(E; m)$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

(H4) $R|f(\cdot, 0)| + R|\mu| < \infty$ m-a.e.

(H5) There exists $v : E \to \mathbb{R}$ such that v is a difference of natural potentials and m-a.e.,

$$v \ge h, \quad Rf^-(\cdot, v) < \infty.$$

(H6) There exists $v : E \to \mathbb{R}$ such that v is a difference of natural potentials and m-a.e.,

$$h_1 \le v \le h_2, \quad R|f(\cdot, v)| < \infty.$$

Let us define the co-potential operator as

$$\hat{G}\phi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{G}_{1/n}\phi, \quad \phi \in L^1(E; m),\ \phi \ge 0$$

and the class $\mathcal{R}$ by (1.2). In [14] it is shown that $\mathcal{R}$ can be equivalently defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\mu : |\mu| \in S,\ R|\mu| < \infty \ m\text{-a.e.}\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Note also that from [19, Corollary 1.3.6] it follows immediately that $\mathcal{M}_{0,b} \subset \mathcal{R}$. In general the inclusion is strict as the following examples show.

Example. Let $\alpha \in (0,2]$, $d \geq 3$, and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open bounded set with smooth boundary. Let us consider the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ associated with α-Laplace operator $(\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ on Ω with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions (see, e.g., [14, Section 5.3]). It is known that $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ is a transient regular Dirichlet form. By [15, Proposition 4.9] there exists constants $0 < c_1 < c_2$ depending only on d, α, D such that $c_1\delta^{\alpha/2}(x) \leq R1(x) \leq c_2\delta^{\alpha/2}(x)$ for $x \in D$, where $\delta(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$. Therefore from (1.2) immediately follows that $L^1(\Omega; \delta^{\alpha/2}(x)\,dx) \subset \mathcal{R}$.

Example. Let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ be a regular symmetric Dirichlet form on $L^2(E;m)$ and let $\mu \in S$. Let us define $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, D[\mathcal{E}^\mu])$ by

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(u,v) = \mathcal{E}(u,v) + \int_E uv\,d\mu, \quad u,v \in D[\mathcal{E}^\mu] = \{u \in D[\mathcal{E}]; \int_E u^2\,d\mu < \infty\}.$$

It is well known (see, e.g., [7, Section 6.1]) that $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, D[\mathcal{E}^\mu])$ is a quasi-regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E;m)$ and the 0-order resolvent R^μ of the process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^\mu, D[\mathcal{E}^\mu])$ is given by

$$R^\mu f(x) = E_x \int_0^\infty e^{-A^\mu_t} f(X_t)\,dt, \quad f \in L^2(E;m). \tag{3.2}$$

From this one can deduce that

$$R^\mu\mu(x) = E_x \int_0^\infty e^{-A^\mu_t}\,dA^\mu_t.$$

The last integral is less than or equal to 1, so from (3.1) it follows that $\mu \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{E}^\mu)$. This shows that even nowhere Radon measures may belong to the class $\mathcal{R}$.

By $\mathcal{FS}^p$ we denote the set of all quasi-continuous functions such that for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$E_x \sup_{t\geq 0} |u(X_t)|^p < \infty.$$

Definition. We say that $u : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of PDE$(f + d\mu)$ if

(a) u is quasi-continuous and $f(\cdot, u)\cdot m \in \mathcal{R}$,

(b) for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$u(x) = E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta f(X_t, u(X_t))\,dt + \int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t\Big).$$

Definition. We say that a pair (u, ν) is a solution of OP$(f + d\mu, h)$ if

(a) u is quasi-continuous and ν, $f(\cdot, u)\cdot m \in \mathcal{R}$,

(b) for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$u(x) = E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta f(X_t, u(X_t))\,dt + \int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t + \int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t\Big), \tag{3.3}$$

(c) $u(x)\geq h(x)$ for m-a.e. $x\in E$,

(d) for q.e. $x\in E$,

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta (u(X_t)-h^*(X_t))\,dA^\nu_t=0$$

for every quasi-continuous function h^* on E such that $h\leq h^*\leq u$ m-a.e.

Remark 3.1. (i) By [14, Lemma 2.9] (see also [13, Lemma 5.4]) condition (d) is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\int_E (u-h^*)\,d\nu=0$$

for every quasi-continuous function h^* such that $h\leq h^*\leq u$ m-a.e. Standards arguments show that in fact one can replace h^* by any quasi-u.s.c. h^{**} such that $h\leq h^{**}\leq u$ m-a.e.

(ii) Let $\hat h$ be a quasi-u.s.c. regularization of h, i.e.

$$\hat h=\text{quasi-essinf}\{\eta\geq h:\eta\text{ is quasi-u.s.c.}\}.$$

Then (u,ν) is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,h)$ iff it is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,\hat h)$. Indeed, if $(\hat u,\hat\nu)$ is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,\hat h)$ then of course $\hat u\geq h$ m-a.e. and for every quasi-u.s.c. h^* such that $h\leq h^*\leq\hat u$ m-a.e. we have

$$\int_E(\hat u-h^*)\,d\hat\nu\leq\int_E(\hat u-\hat h)\,d\hat\nu=0$$

since $\hat h\leq h^*$ m-a.e., hence q.e. Therefore $(\hat u,\hat\nu)$ is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,h)$. Now assume that (u,ν) is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,h)$. Then $\hat h\leq u$ m-a.e. (since u is quasi-continuous) and

$$\int_E(u-\hat h)\,d\nu=0,$$

because $\hat h$ is quasi-u.s.c. and $h\leq\hat h$ m-a.e. Thus (u,ν) is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,\hat h)$. From the above it follows that without loss of generality we can confine ourselves to considering quasi-u.s.c. barriers. Moreover, if h is quasi-u.s.c. then the minimality condition (d) reduces to

$$\int_E(u-h)\,d\nu=0.$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.2 we will use the form $(\mathcal{E}^{\#},D[\mathcal{E}^{\#}])$, which is described in detail in [16, Theorem VI.1.2]. Here let us only mention that $E^{\#}$ is a local compactification of E and $(\mathcal{E}^{\#},D[\mathcal{E}^{\#}])$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(E^{\#};m^{\#})$, which is an extension of the form $(\mathcal{E},D[\mathcal{E}])$. Since $(\mathcal{E}^{\#},D[\mathcal{E}^{\#}])$ is regular, one can associated a Hunt process $\mathbf{M}^{\#}\equiv(\Omega^{\#},\mathcal{F}^{\#},\{X^{\#}_t\}_{t\geq0},\{P^{\#}_x\}_{x\in E^{\#}_\Delta},\zeta^{\#},\theta^{\#})$ with it. $\mathbf{M}^{\#}$ being a Hunt process is a special standard process and moreover its trajectories have left limits on $(0,+\infty)$. $\mathbf{M}^{\#}$ is a standard extension of $\mathbf{M}$, i.e. $P_x=P^{\#}_x$, $X_t=X^{\#}_t$, $t\geq0$, P_x-a.s. for every $x\in E$ and $P^{\#}_x=\delta_x$, $X^{\#}_t=x$, $t\geq0$, for every $x\in E^{\#}\setminus E$. Given $u:E\to\mathbb{R}$ we will denote by $u^{\#}$ its extension to $E^{\#}$ defined as $u^{\#}(x) = u(x)$ for $x \in E$ and $u^{\#}(x) = 0$ for $x \in E^{\#} \setminus E$.

Let u be a real function on E. From now on,

$$f_u(x) \equiv f(x, u(x)), \quad x \in E.$$

Theorem 3.2. *Assume* (H1)–(H4). *Then there exists a solution* (u, ν) *of* $\mathrm{OP}(f + d\mu, h)$ *iff* (H5) *is satisfied. Moreover, if* (H5) *is satisfied then* $u \in \mathcal{FS}^q$ *for* $q \in (0,1)$, $u_n \to u$ *in* $\mathcal{FS}^q$ *for* $q \in (0,1)$ *and* $u_n \nearrow u$ *q.e., where* u_n *is a unique solution of the problem*

$$-Lu_n = f(x, u_n) + \mu + \nu_n \tag{3.4}$$

with $\nu_n = n(u_n - h)^- \cdot m$.

Proof. Necessity of (H5) follows from the fact that u defined by (3.3) is a difference of natural potentials (see [3, p. 178]). To prove that (H5) is sufficient let us first note that from [14, Theorem 3.5] (see also [13, Theorem 4.7]) it follows that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a unique solution u_n of (3.4). Moreover by [13, Proposition 4.9] $u_n \le u_{n+1}$, $n \ge 0$ q.e. By (H5) there exists $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $-Lv = \lambda$ and $f^-(\cdot, v) \in \mathcal{R}$. Hence

$$-Lv = \lambda + f_v + f_v^- - f_v^+.$$

Let $\overline{v}$ be a solution of

$$-L\overline{v} = \lambda^+ + f_{\overline{v}} + f_v^- + \mu^+.$$

By [13, Proposition 4.9], $v \le \overline{v}$ q.e. Therefore $h \le \overline{v}$ q.e. From this we conclude that

$$-L\overline{v} = \lambda^+ + f_{\overline{v}} + f_v^- + \mu^+ + n(\overline{v} - h)^-.$$

By [13, Proposition 4.9] again, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_n \le \overline{v} \quad \text{q.e.} \tag{3.5}$$

Set $u \equiv \sup_{n \ge 1} u_n$ and

$$v_n(x) = -E_x \int_0^{\zeta} f(X_t, u_n(X_t))\, dt - E_x \int_0^{\zeta} dA_t^{\mu}.$$

Since $u_n \le u_{n+1}$ q.e., it follows from (H1) that $v_n \le v_{n+1}$ q.e. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$w_n(x) = u_n(x) + v_n(x).$$

Then

$$w_n(x) = E_x \int_0^{\zeta} dA_t^{\nu_n}.$$

From this (see [3, page 178]) we see that w_n is a natural potential. In particular w_n is an excessive function. Therefore w defined as

$$w(x) = \sup_{n \ge 1} w_n(x), \quad x \in E$$

is again excessive (see [2]) and hence quasi-continuous (see [7, 16]). By (3.5), (H2), (H3), (H5) and the fact that $v\le\overline{v}$ q.e. we have

$$v_n(x)\to E_x\int_0^\zeta f(X_t,u(X_t))\,dt+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t. \tag{3.6}$$

Hence

$$w(x)=u(x)-E_x\int_0^\zeta f(X_t,u(X_t))\,dt-E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t$$

for q.e. $x\in E$. From the above equation and (3.5) we conclude that w is a natural potential. Therefore by [3, Theorem VI.4.22] and quasi-continuity of w there exists CAF A of $\mathbf{M}$ such that $w(x)=E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t$ for q.e. $x\in E$. By [7, 16] there exists a smooth measure ν such that for q.e. $x\in E$,

$$w(x)=E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t.$$

Thus

$$u(x)=E_x\int_0^\zeta f(X_t,u(X_t))\,dt+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t$$

for q.e. $x\in E$. Using the Markov property we can conclude from the above equation that there exists a MAF M of $\mathbf{M}$ such that

$$u(X_t)=\int_t^\zeta f_u(X_r)\,dr+\int_t^\zeta dA^\nu_r+\int_t^\zeta dM_r,\quad 0\le t\le\zeta$$

P_x-a.s. for q.e. $x\in E$. Since u_n,u are quasi-continuous and we know that $u_n\to u$ and $u_n\le u_{n+1}$ q.e., we see that $u^\#,u^\#_n$ are $\mathcal{E}^\#$-quasi-continuous, $u^\#_n\to u^\#$ and $u^\#_n\le u^\#_{n+1}$, $\mathcal{E}^\#$-q.e. Therefore by [16, Theorem IV.5.29], $u^\#_n(X^\#_t)\to u^\#(X^\#_t)$, $t\ge0$, and $u^\#_n(X^\#_{t-})\to u^\#(X^\#_{t-})$, $t\ge0$, $P^\#_x$-a.s. for $\mathcal{E}^\#$-q.e. $x\in E^\#$. By [16, Proposition V.2.28] (see also [16, Proposition V.2.12]), $u^\#_n(X^\#_{t-})=(u^\#_n(X^\#_t))_-$ and $u^\#(X^\#_{t-})=(u^\#(X^\#_t))_-$ for $t\ge0$. Therefore by Dini's theorem, for every $T>0$,

$$\sup_{t\le T}|u^\#_n(X^\#_t)-u^\#(X^\#_t)|\to_{P^\#_x}0$$

for $\mathcal{E}^\#$-q.e. $x\in E$, which implies that

$$\sup_{t\le T}|u_n(X_t)-u(X_t)|\to_{P_x}0 \tag{3.7}$$

for $\mathcal{E}$-q.e. $x\in E$. Since the finite variation parts of the semimatringales $u_0(X),u(X)$ are continuous, $u_0(X),u(X)$ are special semimartingales (see [21]). Therefore there exists a stationary sequence $\{\tau_k\}\subset\mathcal{T}$ such that

$$E_x\sup_{t\le\tau_k}|u(X_t)|+E_x\sup_{t\le\tau_k}|u_0(X_t)|<\infty.$$

Since $u_0 \le u_n \le u$ for $n \ge 1$, (H1) implies that for q.e. $x \in E$,

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\nu_n} \le E_x \sup_{t \le \tau_k} |u(X_t)| + E_x \sup_{t \le \tau_k} |u_0(X_t)| + E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} |f_u(X_t)|\, dt \\ + E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} |f_{u_0}(X_t)|\, dt + E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} dA_t^{|\mu|}. \tag{3.8}$$

This when combined with (3.7) implies that for every $T > 0$,

$$[u_n(X) - u(X)]_T = [M^n - M]_T \to_{P_x} 0,$$

(see [9]), which is equivalent to

$$\sup_{t \le T} |M_t^n - M_t| \to_{P_x} 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Using the arguments from the proof of (3.6) one can show that

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta |f_{u_n}(X_t) - f_u(X_t)|\, dt \to 0. \tag{3.10}$$

From (3.7), (3.9) and (3.10) it follows that for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{t \le T} |\int_0^t dA_t^{\nu_n} - \int_0^t dA_t^{\nu}| \to_{P_x} 0 \tag{3.11}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Observe that by (3.8),

$$E_x \int_0^{\tau_k} (u_n(X_t) - h(X_t))^-\, dt \to 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, which when combined with (3.7) implies that $u \ge h$ m-a.e. Finally, let h^* be a quasi-continuous function such that $h \le h^* \le u$ m-a.e. Then by (3.7) and (3.11), for every $T > 0$ we have

$$\int_0^T (u_n(X_t) - h^*(X_t))^+\, dA_t^{\nu_n} \to_{P_x} \int_0^T (u(X_t) - h^*(X_t))^+\, dA_t^{\nu}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_0^T (u_n(X_t) - h^*(X_t))^+\, dA_t^{\nu_n} = n \int_0^T (u_n(X_t) - h^*(X_t))^+ (u_n(X_t) - h(X_t))^-\, dt \le 0,$$

which implies that

$$\int_0^T (u(X_t) - h^*(X_t))\, dA_t^{\nu} = 0, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.}$$

since $h^* \le u$. This completes the proof. □

In what follows by $\|\cdot\|$ we denote the total variation norm on the space of signed Borel measures on E.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume* (H1)–(H5)*. Let* (u,ν) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h)$*. Then*

$$\|\nu\|\le 2(\|\mu\|+\|f_0\|+\|\lambda^+\|+\|f_v^-\|)$$

with $\lambda=-Lv$*, where* v *is the function of condition* (H5)*.*

Proof. By (3.5),

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t\le E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^{\mu^-}_t+E_x\int_0^\zeta f_u^-(X_t)\,dt+E_x\int_0^\zeta dA^{\lambda^+}_t \\ +E_x\int_0^\zeta f^+_{\bar v}(X_t)\,dt+E_x\int_0^\zeta f_v^-(X_t)\,dt.$$

By [14, Lemma 2.9] (see also [13, Lemma 5.4]),

$$\|\nu\|\le\|\mu^-\|+\|f_u^-\|+\|\lambda^+\|+\|f^+_{\bar v}\|+\|f^-_v\|.$$

By (H1) and (3.5), $f_u^-\le f^-_{\bar v}$. Therefore

$$\|\nu\|\le\|\mu^-\|+\|\lambda^+\|+\|f_{\bar v}\|+\|f^-_v\|.$$

Since $\|f_{\bar v}\|\le\|\lambda^+\|+\|f_v^-\|+\|\mu^+\|+\|f_0\|$ by [14, Lemma 2.9], the desired estimate follows. □

For $k\ge0$ we define the truncature operator $T_k:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ as

$$T_k(y)=\min\{\max\{-k,y\},k\},\quad y\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 3.4. *Assume* (H1)–(H5)*. Let* (u,ν) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h)$*. If* $f_v^-,\mu,\lambda^+,f_0\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ *then* $\nu\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$*,* $T_k(u)\in\mathcal{F}_e$ *for every* $k\ge0$ *and*

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k(u),T_k(u))\le 2k(\|\mu\|+\|\nu\|+\|f_0\|),\quad k\ge0. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. Follows from Proposition 3.3 and [14, Proposition 3.7, Theorem 4.2]. □

The uniqueness of solutions of the obstacle problem follows from the following comparison result in which we assume that $f_1,f_2:E\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, $h_1,h_2:E\to\mathbb{R}$ are measurable and $\mu_1,\mu_2\in\mathcal{R}$.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that* (u_i,ν_i)*,* $i=1,2$*, is a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f_i+\mu_i,h_i)$*. If*

$$d\mu_1\le d\mu_2,\quad h_1\le h_2\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

and either

$$f_1 \textit{ satisfies } (\mathrm{H1}) \textit{ and } f_1(\cdot,u_2)\le f_2(\cdot,u_2)\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

or

$$f_2 \textit{ satisfies } (\mathrm{H1}) \textit{ and } f_1(\cdot,u_1)\le f_2(\cdot,u_1)\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

then $u_1\le u_2$ *q.e. Moreover, if* $h_1=h_2$ *and* f_1,f_2 *satisfy (H1), then* $d\nu_1\ge d\nu_2$*.*

Proof. Suppose that f_1 satisfies (H1) and $f_1(\cdot,u_2)\le f_2(\cdot,u_2)$ m-a.e. Since the Revuz correspondence is one-to-one, we have

$$\int_0^t f_1(X_r,u_2(X_r))\,dr\le\int_0^t f_2(X_r,u_2(X_r))\,dr,\qquad \int_0^t dA^{\mu_1}_r\le\int_0^t dA^{\mu_2}_r,\quad t\ge 0.$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula (see, e.g., [21, Theorem IV.70]), for every $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(u_1-u_2)^+(X_t)&\le(u_1-u_2)^+(X_\tau)\\&\quad+\int_t^\tau(f_1(X_r,u_1(X_r))-f_2(X_r,u_2(X_r)))\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dr\\&\quad+\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,d(A^{\mu_1}_r-A^{\mu_2}_r)+\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dA^{\nu_1}_r\\&\quad-\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dA^{\nu_2}_r-\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_{r-})\,d(M^1_r-M^2_r)\\&=\sum_{i=1}^6 I_i(t,\tau).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $I_2(t,\tau)\le 0$ by the assumptions on f_1,f_2. Since $h_1\le u_1\wedge u_2\le u_1$,

$$I_4(t,\tau)=\int_t^\tau(u_1-u_2)^{-1}\cdot(u_1-u_1\wedge u_2)(X_r)\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dA^{\nu_1}_r=0.$$

It is also clear that $I_3(t,\tau)\le 0$ and $I_5(t,\tau)\le 0$. Let $\{\tau_k\}\subset\mathcal{T}$ be a fundamental sequence for the martingale M^1-M^2. Then by the above estimates,

$$E_x(u_1-u_2)^+(X_{t\wedge\tau})\le E_x(u_1-u_2)^+(X_\tau)$$

for q.e. $x\in E$. From this and the fact that u_1,u_2 are differences of natural potentials we conclude that $u_1\le u_2$ q.e. Now assume that $h_1=h_2$. By Theorem 3.2, for every $T>0$,

$$\sup_{t\le T}|A^{\nu^1_n}_t-A^{\nu_1}_t|+\sup_{t\le T}|A^{\nu^2_n}_t-A^{\nu_2}_t|\rightarrow_{P_x}0$$

for q.e. $x\in E$, where u^i_n is a solution of

$$-Lu^i_n=f_i(x,u^i_n)+\mu_i+n(u^i_n-h_1)^-$$

and $\nu^i_n=n(u^i_n-h_1)^-\cdot m$. By [13, Proposition 4.9], $u^1_n\le u^2_n$ q.e., which implies the second assertion of the proposition. □

Corollary 3.6. *Under* (H1) *there exists at most one solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h)$.

In the case where L is a uniformly elliptic divergence form operator with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions existence and uniqueness of a solution (u,ν) to the problem (1.1) (in the sense of the definition of the present paper) was proved in [23]. In [23] it is assumed that h is quasi-continuous, $\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{0,b}$ and f satisfies (H1), (H2) and slightly stronger than (H3)–(H5) integrability conditions. Note also that in the special case considered in [23] u is an entropy solution of (1.1).

Definition. We say that v is a supersolution of PDE$(f+d\mu)$ if there exists a positive $\lambda\in\mathcal{R}$ such that v is a solution of PDE$(f+d\mu+d\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.7. *Assume* (H1)–(H4). *Let u be a solution of* OP$(f+d\mu,h)$. *Then*

$$u=\text{quasi-essinf}\{v\geq h: v \textit{ is a supersolution of } \mathrm{PDE}(f+d\mu)\}.$$

Proof. Let v be a supersolution of PDE$(f+d\mu)$ and $v\geq h$ m-a.e. Then

$$-Lv=f(\cdot,v)+\mu+\lambda+n(v-h)^-.$$

On the other hand, we know that $u_n\nearrow u$ q.e., where u_n is a solution of

$$-Lu_n=f(\cdot,u_n)+\mu+n(u_n-h)^-.$$

By [13, Proposition 4.9], $u_n\leq v$, which implies the desired assertion. □

4 Two-sided obstacle problem

Definition. We say that a pair (u,ν) is a solution of OP$(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$ if

(a) u is quasi-continuous and $\nu\in\mathcal{R}$, $f(\cdot,u)\cdot m\in\mathcal{R}$,

(b) for q.e. $x\in E$,

$$u(x)=E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta f(X_t,u(X_t))\,dt+\int_0^\zeta dA^\mu_t+\int_0^\zeta dA^\nu_t\Big).$$

(c) $h_1(x)\leq u(x)\leq h_2(x)$ for m-a.e. $x\in E$,

(d) for q.e. $x\in E$,

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta(u(X_t)-h_1^*(X_t))\,dA^{\nu^+}_t=E_x\int_0^\zeta(h_2^*(X_t)-u(X_t))\,dA^{\nu^-}_t=0$$

for every quasi-continuous functions h_1^*,h_2^* on E such that $h_1\leq h_1^*\leq u\leq h_2^*\leq h_2$ m-a.e.

Proposition 4.1. *Let (u_i,ν_i), $i=1,2$, be a solution of* OP$(f_i+d\mu_i,h_1^i,h_2^i)$. *Assume that*

$$d\mu_1\leq d\mu_2,\quad h_1^1\leq h_1^2,\quad h_2^1\leq h_2^2\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

and either

$$f_1 \textit{ satisfies } \mathrm{(H1)} \textit{ and } f_1(\cdot,u_2)\leq f_2(\cdot,u_2)\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

or

$$f_2 \textit{ satisfies } \mathrm{(H1)} \textit{ and } f_1(\cdot,u_1)\leq f_2(\cdot,u_1)\ m\text{-a.e.}$$

Then $u_1(x)\leq u_2(x)$ for q.e. $x\in E$.

Proof. Since the Revuz correspondence is one-to-one,

$$\int_0^t f_1(X_r,u_2(X_r))\,dr \le \int_0^t f_2(X_r,u_2(X_r))\,dr, \quad \int_0^t dA^{\mu_1}_r \le \int_0^t dA^{\mu_2}_r, \quad t\ge 0.$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula (see [21, Theorem IV.70]), for every $\tau\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(u_1-u_2)^+(X_r) &= (u_1-u_2)^+(X_\tau)\\ &\quad+\int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)(f_1(X_r,u_1(X_r))-f_2(X_r,u_2(X_r)))\,dr\\ &\quad+\int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,d(A^{\mu_1}_r-A^{\mu_2}_r)+\int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dA^{\nu_1}_r\\ &\quad-\int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_r)\,dA^{\nu_2}_r-\int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(X_{r-})\,d(M^1_r-M^2_r)\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^6 I_i(t,\tau).\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $I_2(t,\tau)\le 0$ and $I_3(t,\tau)\le 0$. By the minimality of ν_1, ν_2 (condition (d) in the definition of the solution of the obstacle problem) we have

$$I_4(t,\tau)\le \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(u_1-u_2)^{-1}(u_1-u_1\wedge u_2)\,dA^{\nu_1^+}_r=0$$

and

$$I_5(t,\tau)\le \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}}(u_1-u_2)^{-1}(u_1\vee u_2-u_2)\,dA^{\nu_2^-}_r=0.$$

The rest of the proof runs as in the proof of Proposition 3.5. □

Corollary 4.2. *Under* (H1) *there exists at most one solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume* (H1)–(H4). *Then there exists a solution* (u,ν) *of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$ *iff* (H6) *is satisfied. Moreover, if* (H6) *is satisfied then* $u\in\mathcal{FS}^q$ *for* $q\in(0,1)$ *and*

(i) *if* $u_{n,k}$ *is a solution of the equation*

$$-Lu_{n,k}=f(\cdot,u_{n,k})+\mu+n(u_{n,k}-h_1)^- - k(u_{n,k}-h_2)^+$$

then $u_{n,k}\to u$ *q.e. and in* $\mathcal{FS}^q$ *for* $q\in(0,1)$ *as* $n,k\to\infty$,

(ii) *if* (u_k,α_k) *is a solution of the obstacle problem*

$$-Lu_k=f(\cdot,u_k)+\mu+\alpha_k-k(u_k-h_2)^+,\quad u_k\ge h_1$$

then $u_k\searrow u$ *q.e. and in* $\mathcal{FS}^q$ *for* $q\in(0,1)$ *as* $k\to\infty$.

Proof. Necessity of (H6) follows from [3, p. 178]. To prove that (H6) is sufficient let us first observe that by Proposition 3.5, $u_k\ge u_{k+1}$ and $d\alpha_k\le d\alpha_{k+1}$. By (H6) there exist a function v and a measure $\lambda\in\mathcal{R}$ such that

$$-Lv=\lambda,\quad f(\cdot,v)\in\mathcal{R},\quad h_1\le v\le h_2\quad m\text{-a.e.}$$

Hence

$$-Lv = f(x,v) + (\lambda^+ + f^-(x,v)) - (\lambda^- + f^+(x,v)) + n(v-h_1)^- - k(v-h_2)^+.$$

Let $\overline{v}_n$ be a solution of the equation

$$-L\overline{v}_n = f(x,\overline{v}_n) - \lambda^- - f^+(x,v) - \mu^- + n(\overline{v}_n - h_1)^-.$$

By Proposition 3.5, $\overline{v}_n \le v$ q.e., and consequently, $\overline{v}_n \le h_2$, m-a.e. Therefore

$$-L\overline{v}_n = f(x,\overline{v}_n) - \lambda^- - f^+(x,v) - \mu^- + n(\overline{v}_n - h_1)^- - k(\overline{v}_n - h_2)^+.$$

By Proposition 3.5 again, $u_{n,k} \ge \overline{v}_n$ q.e., which implies that

$$n(u_{n,k} - h_1)^- \le n(\overline{v}_n - h_1)^-. \tag{4.1}$$

By Theorem 3.2, $\overline{v}_n \nearrow \overline{v}$ q.e. where $(\overline{v},\overline{\nu})$ is a solution of the obstacle problem

$$-L\overline{v} = f(x,\overline{v}) - \lambda^- - f^+(x,v) - \mu^- + \overline{\nu}, \quad \overline{v} \ge h_1.$$

Hence

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\overline{\nu}_n} \to E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\overline{\nu}} \tag{4.2}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, where $\overline{\nu}_n = n(\overline{v}_n - h_1)^- \cdot m$. Write $\alpha_{n,k} = n(u_{n,k} - h_1)^- \cdot m$. By (4.1), $E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\alpha_{n,k}} \le E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\overline{\nu}_n}$, whereas by Theorem 3.2, $E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\alpha_{n,k}} \to E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\alpha_k}$ for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\alpha_k} \le E_x\int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\overline{\nu}} \tag{4.3}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Since $d\alpha_k \le d\alpha_{k+1}$,

$$dA_t^{\alpha_k} \le dA_t^{\alpha_{k+1}}, \quad P_x\text{-a.s.} \tag{4.4}$$

Set $A_t \equiv \sup_{k\ge1} A_t^{\alpha_k}$. By [20, Lemma 3.2], A is càdlàg and hence, as a limit of additive functionals, is a positive additive functional. In fact, by [7, 16], A is PCAF of $\mathbf{M}$ and there exists a smooth measure α such that $A = A^\alpha$. Moreover, by (4.2) and (4.3), $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$. By (4.4) and Dini's theorem, for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{t\le T} |A_t^{\alpha_k} - A_t^\alpha| \to_{P_x} 0 \tag{4.5}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Let $u(x) \equiv \inf_{k\ge1} u_k(x)$. Thanks to (4.5) we may now repeat arguments from the proof of Theorem 3.2 to show that u is quasi-continuous and moreover that

$$E_x\int_0^\zeta |f_{u_k}(X_t) - f_u(X_t)|\,dt \to 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, there exists a nonnegative measure $\delta \in \mathcal{R}$ such that for every $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{t\le T} |A_t^{\delta_k} - A_t^\delta| \to_{P_x} 0 \tag{4.6}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, where $\delta_k = k(u_k - h_2)^+ \cdot m$,

$$\sup_{t \le T} |u_k(X_t) - u(X_t)| \to_{P_x} 0 \tag{4.7}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, and finally that

$$u(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta f_u(X_t)\,dt + E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu + E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\alpha - E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\delta \tag{4.8}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. By (4.3), $u \ge h_1$ m-a.e. By the definition of a solution of the obstacle problem,

$$u_k(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta f_{u_k}(X_t)\,dt + E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\mu + E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\alpha_k} - E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\delta_k}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. From the above equation, (4.8) and the convergence results for $u_k, f_{u_k}, A^{\alpha_k}$ we have already proved we conclude that

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^{\delta_k} \to E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\delta \tag{4.9}$$

for q.e. $x \in E$, which implies that $u \le h_2$ m-a.e. Using (4.5)–(4.7) we can show in the same way as in the proof of minimality of the measure ν in Theorem 3.2 that for every quasi-continuous h_1^*, h_2^* such that $h_1 \le h_1^* \le u \le h_2^* \le h_2$ m-a.e. we have

$$E_x \int_0^\zeta (h_2^*(X_t) - u(X_t))\,dA_t^\delta = E_x \int_0^\zeta (u(X_t) - h_1^*(X_t))\,dA_t^\alpha = 0$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Of course, putting $\nu = \delta - \alpha$ yields the above equation with ν^- in place of δ and ν^+ in place of α. Thus the pair (u, ν) is a solution of OP$(f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$. Observe that

$$w_n \le u_{n,k} \le u_k \quad \text{q.e.}, \tag{4.10}$$

where (w_n, β_n) is a solution of the obstacle problem

$$-Lw_n = f(\cdot, w_n) + n(w_n - h_1)^- + \mu - \beta_n, \quad w_n \le h_2.$$

To see this it is enough to observe that

$$-Lu_k = f(\cdot, u_k) + n(u_k - h_1)^- - k(u_k - h_2)^+ + \mu + \alpha_k$$

and

$$-Lw_n = f(\cdot, w_n) + n(w_n - h_1)^- - k(w_n - h_2)^+ + \mu - \beta_n,$$

and apply Proposition 3.5. By the same method as in the case of $\{u_n\}$ one can show that the limit of $\{w_n\}$ is the first component of the solution of OP$(f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$. Hence, by Corollary 4.2, $w_n \to u$ q.e. Finally observe that by (4.3) and (4.5)–(4.7), for every $q \in (0, 1)$,

$$E_x \sup_{t \ge 0} |A_t^{\delta_k} - A_t^\delta|^q + E_x \sup_{t \ge 0} |A_t^{\alpha_k} - A_t^\alpha|^q \to 0$$

for q.e. $x\in E$. Moreover, by the Tanaka-Meyer formula (see [21, Theorem IV.70]),

$$|u_k(X_t)|\le E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta |f(X_t,0)|\,dt+\int_0^\zeta dA^{|\mu|}_t+\int_0^\zeta dA^{|\nu|}_t|\mathcal{F}_t\Big).$$

Therefore by [6, Lemma 6.1], for every $q\in(0,1)$,

$$E_x\sup_{t\ge0}|u_k(X_t)|^q\le(1-q)^{-1}E_x\Big(\int_0^\zeta |f(X_t,0)|+\int_0^\zeta dA^{|\mu|}_t+\int_0^\zeta dA^{|\nu|}_t\Big)^q.$$

From this we conclude that $u_n\to u$ in $\mathcal{FS}^q$ for $q\in(0,1)$. In the same manner we can see that $w_n\to u$ in $\mathcal{FS}^q$ for $q\in(0,1)$, which when combined with (4.10) implies that $u_{n,k}\to u$ in $\mathcal{FS}^q$ for $q\in(0,1)$. □

Corollary 4.4. *Assume* (H1)–(H4), (H6) *and retain the notation of Theorem 4.3 and its proof. Then for every* $q\in(0,1)$,

$$E_x\sup_{t\ge0}|A^{\alpha_k}_t-A^{\nu^+}_t|^q+E_x\sup_{t\ge0}|A^{\delta_k}_t-A^{\nu^-}_t|^q\to0$$

for q.e. $x\in E$.

Proof. One can regard (u,ν^-) as a solution of $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu+d\nu^+,h_2)$ (with upper barrier). Therefore by Theorem 3.2, $y_k\searrow u$ q.e., where

$$-Ly_k=f(x,y_k)-k(y_k-h_2)^++\nu^++\mu,$$

and for every $q\in(0,1)$,

$$E_x\sup_{t\ge0}|A^{\beta_k}_t-A^{\nu^-}_t|^q\to0 \tag{4.11}$$

for q.e. $x\in E$, where $\beta_k=k(y_k-h_2)^+\cdot m$. Since $y_k\searrow u$, $y_k\ge h_1$ q.e. Therefore

$$-Ly_k=f(x,y_k)+n(y_k-h_1)^--k(y_k-h_2)^++\nu^++\mu.$$

By Proposition 3.5, $y_k\ge u_{n,k}$ q.e., and so $k(u_{n,k}-h_2)^+\le k(y_k-h_2)^+$. By (4.11) and the convergence of $\{A^{\alpha_{n,k}}\}$ showed in the proof of Theorem 3.2, $dA^\alpha\le dA^{\nu^+}$, which implies that $d\alpha\le d\nu^+$. The same reasoning applied to the measure δ shows that $d\delta\le d\nu^-$. From this and minimality of the Jordan decomposition of measure ν we conclude that $\alpha=\nu^+$, $\delta=\nu^-$. □

Proposition 4.5. *Assume* (H1)–(H4), (H6) *and let* (u,ν) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$. *Then*

$$\|\nu^+\|\le3(\|\mu\|+\|f_0\|+\|\lambda^+\|+\|f_v^-\|)$$

and

$$\|\nu^-\|\le3(\|\mu\|+\|f_0\|+\|\lambda^-\|+\|f_v^+\|)$$

with $\lambda=-Lv$*, where* v *is the function of condition* (H6).

Proof. From (4.3), (4.4) and [14, Lemma 2.9] we deduce that $\|\alpha\| \le \|\overline{\nu}\|$. Hence $\|\nu^+\| \le \|\overline{\nu}\|$ since $\alpha = \nu^+$ by Corollary 4.4. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.3,

$$\|\overline{\nu}\| \le 2(\|\lambda^+\| + \|f_v^-\| + \|\mu^-\| + \|f_0\| + \|\lambda^+\| + \|f_v^-\|),$$

which proves the desired inequality for ν^+. The inequality for ν^- can be proved in much the same way. □

Proposition 4.6. *Assume* (H1)–(H4), (H6) *and let* (u,ν) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$*. If* $\lambda, f_v, f_0, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$*. Then* $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{0,b}$*,* $T_k(u) \in \mathcal{F}_e$ *for every* $k \ge 0$ *and* (3.12) *is satisfied.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 4.5 and [14, Proposition 3.7, Theorem 4.2]. □

Proposition 4.7. *Assume* (H1)–(H4)*. If* (u,ν) *is a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$ *then* u *admits the representation* (1.6)*.*

Proof. Let v be a supersolution of $\mathrm{PDE}(f+d\mu-d\nu^-)$ such that $v \ge h_1$ m-a.e. Then there exists a nonnegative measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$-Lv = f(x,v) + \mu - \nu^- + \lambda.$$

Since $v \ge h_1$ m-a.e.,

$$-Lv = f(x,v) + \mu + n(v-h_1)^- - \nu^- + \lambda.$$

Observe that the pair (u,ν^+) is a solution of $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu-d\nu^-,h_1)$. Therefore by Theorem 3.2, $u_n \nearrow u$ q.e., where

$$-Lu_n = f(x,u_n) + \mu + n(u_n-h_1)^- - \nu^-.$$

By Proposition 3.5, $u_n \le v$ q.e., which implies that $u \le v$ q.e. □

5 The Lewy-Stampacchia inequality

In this section we prove Lewy-Stampacchia type inequality in our general framework. In the case of one barrier and regular data inequalities of such type for nonlocal operators (on $\mathbb{R}^n$) are proved in [24].

Let us stress that the measures $f_{h_1} \cdot m, \mu, Lh_1$ and ν in the theorem below need not be finite.

Theorem 5.1. *Let* $\mu \in \mathcal{R}$ *and let* (u,ν) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(f+d\mu,h_1,h_2)$*. If* h_1 *is a difference of natural potentials then*

$$\nu^+ \le \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}} \cdot (f_{h_1} \cdot m + \mu + Lh_1)^-. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. By the assumption there exists a measure $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$h_1(x) = E_x \int_0^\zeta dA_t^\alpha$$

for q.e. $x \in E$. Therefore there exists a MAF M^1 of $\mathbf{M}$ such that

$$h_1(X_t) = \int_t^\zeta dA_t^\alpha - \int_t^\zeta dM_t^1, \quad t \in [0, \zeta].$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula (see [21, Theorem IV.70]),

$$\begin{aligned}(u - h_1)^+(X_t) = (u - h_1)^+(X_0) &- \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u>h_1\}}(X_r) f_u(X_r)\, dr \\ &- \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u>h_1\}}(X_r)\, d(A_r^{\nu^+} + A_r^\mu - A_r^\alpha) + \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u>h_1\}}(X_r)\, dA_r^{\gamma^-} \\ &- \frac{1}{2} L_t^0(Y) + J_t^+ + \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u>h_1\}}(X_r)\, d(M_r - M_r^1),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_t^+ = \sum_{0<s\le t} (\varphi(Y_s) - \varphi(Y_{s-}) - \varphi'(Y_{s-})\Delta Y_s), \quad Y_t = (u - h_1)(X_t), \quad \varphi(x) = x^+$$

and φ' denotes the left derivative of φ. Since $Y_t \ge 0$, $t \ge 0$, we conclude from the above equations that

$$\begin{aligned}0 = &\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r) f_{h_1}(X_r)\, dr + \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r)\, d(A_r^{\nu^+} + A_r^\mu - A_r^\alpha) \\ &- \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r)\, dA_r^{\nu^-} + \frac{1}{2} L_t^0(Y) + J_t^+ - \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_{r-})\, d(M_r - M_r^1).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_0^t dA_r^{\nu^+} = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r)\, dA_r^{\nu^+}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} L_t^0(Y) + J_t^{+,p} + \int_0^t dA_r^{\nu^+} = &- \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r) f_{h_1}(X_r)\, dr \\ &+ \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_r)\, d(A_r^{\nu^-} - A_r^\mu + A_r^\alpha),\end{aligned}$$

where $J_t^{+,p}$ is the dual predictable projection of the process J_t^+. Since dA^{ν^+}, dA^{ν^-} are orthogonal, it follows from the above that

$$\begin{aligned}dA_t^{\nu^+} &\le \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_t)(-f_{h_1}(X_t)\, dt - dA_t^\mu + dA_t^\alpha)^+ \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{u=h_1\}}(X_t)(f_{h_1}(X_t)\, dt + dA_t^\mu - dA_t^\alpha)^-,\end{aligned}$$

which implies (5.1). □

References

[1] Bénilan, P. Boccardo, L., Gallouët, T., Gariepy, R., Pierre, M., Vazquez, J.-L.: L^1-theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **22** (1995) 241–273.

[2] Beznea, L., Boboc, N.: *Potential Theory and Right Processes.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht 2004.

[3] Blumenthal, M.R., Getoor, R.K.: *Markov Processes and Potential Theory.* Dover Publications, New York 2007.

[4] Boccardo, L., Gallouët, T.: Nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations involving measure data. *J. Funct. Anal.* **87** (1989) 149–169.

[5] Brezis, H.: Problemes unilateraux. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **51** (1972) 1–168.

[6] Briand, Ph., Delyon, B., Hu, Y., Pardoux, E., Stoica, L.: L^p solutions of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **108** (2003) 109–129.

[7] Fukushima, M., Oshima, Y., Takeda, M.: *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes.* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 1994.

[8] Jacob, N.: *Pseudo-Differential Operators and Markov Processes. Vol. I: Fourier Analysis and Semigroups.* Imperial College Press, London 2001.

[9] Jacod, J.: Convergence en loi de semimartingales et variation quadratique, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **850** (1981) 547–560.

[10] Kinderlehrer, D., Stampacchia, G.: *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications.* Academic Press, Inc., New York-London 1980.

[11] Klimsiak, T.: Semilinear elliptic systems with measure data. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* (2013) DOI 10.1007/s10231-013-0364-4.

[12] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Obstacle problem for semilinear parabolic equations with measure data (2013). arXiv:1301.5795.

[13] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Dirichlet forms and semilinear elliptic equations with measure data. *J. Funct. Anal.* **265** (2013) 890–925.

[14] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Semilinear elliptic equations with measure data and quasi-regular Dirichlet forms (2013). arXiv:1307.0717.

[15] Kulczycki, T.: Properties of Green function of symmetric stable processes, *Probab. Math. Statist.* **17** (1997) 339–364.

[16] Ma, Z., Röckner, M.: *Introduction to the Theory of (Non-Symmetric) Dirichlet Forms.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1992.

[17] Mokrane, A., Murat, F.: The Lewy-Stampacchia inequality for bilateral problems. *Ricerche Mat.* **53** (2004) 139–182.

[18] Orsina, L., Ponce, A.C.: Semilinear elliptic equations and systems with diffuse measures. *J. Evol. Equ.* **8** (2008) 781–812.

[19] Oshima, Y.: *Semi-Dirichlet Forms and Markov Processes.* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2013.

[20] Peng, S., Xu, M.: The smallest g-supermartingale and reflected BSDE with single and double L2 obstacles. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Probab. Statist.* **41** (2005), 605–630.

[21] Protter, P.: *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations.* 2nd ed. Springer, Berlin 2004.

[22] Quittner, P., Souplet, Ph.: A priori estimates and existence for elliptic systems via bootstrap in weighted Lebesgue spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **174** (2004) 49–81.

[23] Rozkosz, A., Słomiński, L.: Stochastic representation of entropy solutions of semilinear elliptic obstacle problems with measure data, *Electron. J. Probab.* **17** (2012), no. 40, 1–27.

[24] Servadei, R., Valdinoci, E.: Lewy-Stampacchia type estimates for variational inequalities driven by (non)local operators, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, **29** (2013), no.3, 1091–1126.

[25] Stampacchia, G.: Équations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus. *Séminaire de Mathémtiques Supérieures* **16** (1966).

[26] Stampacchia, G.: Le problème de Dirichlet pour les èquations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* (Grenoble) **15** (1965), 189–258.